30 MAY 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Associate Deputy to the DCI for the

Intelligence Community

THROUGH:

Deputy Director for Intelligence

SUBJECT:

Draft DCI Intelligence Community Objectives

for 1975

1. We understand that the short time fuse under which you have been operating, but regret the lack of sufficient time to provide thoughtful and constructive comment. What follows is the best we can do given the complexities and the many interrelationships which warrant some thought.

2. With regard to the covering letter:

- a. We found the overall tone of the letter a bit obsequious. Minor changes in phrasing here and there should overcome it.
- b. The letter suggests that the 5 November 1971 memo from the President established USIB (line 8), which is obviously not true.
- c. We have some doubts about the utility of the IRAC mechanism and wonder whether the DCI should address this point as directly as it is done in the first paragraph. It is not inconceivable, for example, that within a year the DCI will recommend the consolidation of IRAC and USIB—a point which is even suggested by the phrasing of the sentence in question. The sentence would be better phrased, in our view, if it conveyed a sense of continuing experimentation with IRAC and NSCIC as we try to cope with our problems.
- d. The reference (beginning at the bottom of page one) to being responsive to the Congress—consistent with our need to protect sources and methods—sounds defensive. Do we really need to qualify our responsiveness to Congress in this letter, in this way?

Working Copy

- e. We think that the claim at the end of paragraph three that,

 "... substantive intelligence needs of our customers are coming
 to dominate discussions and decisions about the Intelligence
 Community overstates the point. In general, it seems to us that
 we have only begun what will be a long and complicated effort
 to establish a process that relates substantive needs and decision—
 making.
- 3. With regard to the substantive objectives, we have appended informal DDI and DDS&T comments. Although we applied the shortness of the list, we believe that the objectives, as stated, are so general as to provide no basis whatever for subsequent evaluation. The milestones attached to the substantive objectives give some bench marks by which to measure progress, but we find them heavily procedural in nature and concerned mostly with the flow of paper.
- describe processes, rather than specific tasks to be accomplished. We suggest that a better list of resource management objectives from the DCI to the President would be comprised of such tasks. Some "top-of-the-head" examples are: (a) the DCI's assessment of what the legislative base should be for the Intelligence Community of the 1970's and 1980's; (b) a candid review of the effectiveness with which the DCI has been able to carry out his responsibilities for community management without the real authority to do so; and (c) a candid evaluation of the impact that five years of personnel and dollar reductions have had on the Intelligence Community with regard to the volume and quality of its product, its flexibility, developmental efforts for the future, and the like.
- 5. With regard to the objectives in general, some of them (including their subobjectives and milestones) have resource implications which would require reprogramming; resources for FY 1975 are already pratty-well fixed.

SECRET

6. Finally, with all due respect for OMB's apparent interest in flushing out objectives with milestones, is the kind of detail carried in Tab A on milestones really appropriate for a letter from the DCI to the President? It seems to us that the real purpose of the list of milestones must be to give OMB an agenda for meetings during the year on progress against objectives. They need no such excuse. They are free to inquire at any time about our progress.

	25X
Comphysition	·
Compholler	

Attachments:

- 1. Memo to DDS4T frm D/SI dtd 24 May 74 re Draft DCI Message to the President
- 2. Memo to D/Compt frm \square O/DDI, undtd. re DDI Comments on the DCI's Resource Management Objectives for the Intelligence Community

25X1

Distribution:

Original - Addse

- 1 DDI
- 1 Compt Subj (PSG)
- · 1 Compt

25X1

Chrono O/Compt.

25X1

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2004/08/30 : CIA-RDP80M01082A000800100005-2

25X1	MEMORANDUM FOR:	D/Comptroller 25X1	
25X1	FROM :	O/DDI	
	SUBJECT :	DDI Comments on the DCI's Resource Management Objectives for the Intelligence Community	

- 1. The milestone date, set for the various objectives apparently have no relation to each other and there could be quite a simultaneous impact on manpower.
- The DCI will require a monitor to keep track of all the actions; doubt that the IC Staff can monitor itself.
- 3. The sub-objectives, which are left unspecified as to milestones, such as 7a and 7b, could allow for the proliferation of more tasks conceived in the IC arena.
- Collection guidance and assessment as called for under Objective
 properly is the province of IRS.

5. Page A8

- a. The NOIWON goal appears quite realistic.
- b. We are indeed trying to reorganize the Watch Committee, but it will take more than a piece of paper to complete this by 1 January.
- c. A feasible study on a text editing net will be useful, as long as we are not committed to its use.
- d. Most important, there has been no agreement that NOIAN should even be tested. To include in this document a target date on which to begin operations is not only unrealistic but is riding roughsod over those who have to do the work.

6. Page Al6.

- a. We do expect that we will be able to meet roughly the 1 July 74 target for the NIB.
- b. We have been arguing for a National Intelligence Situation Summary during crises periods for a considerable time. To our knowledge, no planning in this field is under way. Unless it begins soon, and unless those parties that will have to do the work are involved in the planning, there is no possibility of meeting a 1 January date.
- c. The report asked for by 1 July 75 could be written now. It would show that CIA had eliminated the CIB in favor of the NIB.

7. Objective 6, page A-11: KIQs/KEP.

While reference is made to KEP as a "pilot" program, there is a clear indication that the review of KEP I is to correct deficiencies—and that it will continue (as KEP II). This is of particular significance to this Directorate, especially in view of Mr. Proctor's statement in the recent Management Committee that KEP was too burdensome and should be abolished.

8. Sub-Objective 8-A, page A-15: Production of coordinated national intelligence products.

The objective is to increase the number of such (coordinated) publications and decrease the serial publications of individual agencies. In so doing, the plan calls for beginning publication of a National Intelligence Bulletin around 1 July 1974 and a National Intelligence Situation Summary (NISS) sometime after 1 January 1975. In the list of other national intelligence products, the report does not mention the NID.

ILLEGIB

9. Sub-Objective 8-B, page A-17: SIGINT

ILLEGIB Info item NSA will complete the "first integrated longterm SIGINT plan" this year.

10. Sub-Objective S-C, page A-18: Imagery.

ExCom will complete by October 1975 the "first long-term National Imagery Intelligence Plan."

11. Sub-Objective 8-D, page A-19: Human Source Collection.

This objective reconstitutes the USIB Human Sources Committee (a decision that Colby has already made) with "broad responsibilities to review and make recommendations concerning human source collection programs." But it does seem a little odd that, in the same breath, IC Staff is given responsibility for preparing "long-term plans for more effective coordination or integration of human source collection programs." This would seem to me to be more appropriately a function of the HS Committee, above. (I am touching on this sub-objective only because of C/IRS interest in the Committee.)

12. Sub-Objective 9-B, page A-24: Information handling.

This is aimed at improving techniques for info handling, and for the analysis and presentation of intelligence data. There are three milestones of interest to us:

a. January 1975: "USIB will approve recommendations for coordinated development of competer terminals and telecommunications programs with particular emphasis on the use of terminals to exchange crisis management information and to perform indications and warning functions." This is related to Substantive Sub-Objective 4-B, page A-8, on the National Operations and Intelligence Watch Officers Net (NOIWON) and reorganization of the Watch Committee and NIC. I presume, therefore, that you will get comments for Lehman/ on this.

25X1

b. 1 April 1975: USIB consider recommendations having to do with member agencies accepting responsibility, as a service of common concern, for maintenance of selected major files for the community. This is not the first time around on this one. An earlier (COINS-related) version definitely had built into it the possibility of the assignment of such responsibility whether or not the Agency had an interest in the substance of the file. We said this would not work and did not concur. But we don't have a problem with what is proposed here as long as we have the option to accept or reject responsibility for main-

- approaches to extend user and analyst capacity for analyzing, perceiving and understanding intelligence information. I am not aware of any particular activity by the IC Staff in this area--but they have a whole year before a report is due.
- 13. I have also made some suggested editing changes to the draft memo: